Appl'n No: 10/539,741

Amdt dated September 14, 2009

Reply to Office action dated August 4, 2009

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7, 11-32, and 35-39 are pending in the above-captioned application. Claims

15-32 were previously withdrawn. Claims 2, 8-10, 33, and 34 were previously cancelled.

Claims 1, 3, 7, 11, 36, and 38 have been amended. Claims 1, 7, 36, and 38 are in independent

form.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

2-4. Claims 1, 3-7, 11-14, and 35-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first

paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant respectfully

traverses the rejection.

The Examiner states that "[t]here is no support from the written specification for the

torque lock 210 (Figs. 5a-5b) having a non-circular cross-section complementary to the non-

circular torque lock portion 82 of the tool shaft. In fact, Figures 5a-5b shows a generally circular

torque lock 210 that is not complementary to the non-circular torque lock portion 83 of the tool

shaft."

In response, Applicant has amended the specification to more clearly identify the non-

circular cross-section of the torque lock 210.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 7, 36, and 38 to include the limitation "the

torque lock having at least a portion of non-circular cross-section non-complementary to the

torque lock portion of the tool shaft to prevent rotation of the torque lock portion of the tool shaft

in the torque lock." The portion of the torque lock 210 including the torque transfer member 230

renders the cross-section of the torque lock 210 non-circular. The non-circular cross-section of

the torque lock 210 is non-complementary to the torque lock portion 83 of the tool shaft 81,

thereby preventing rotation of the tool shaft 81 relative to the torque lock 210.

Applicant has also amended claims 3 and 11 to reflect that the cross-section of the torque

lock is *non-complementary* to the cross-section of the torque lock portion of the tool shaft.

13

Appl'n No: 10/539,741

Amdt dated September 14, 2009

Reply to Office action dated August 4, 2009

Claims 3-6, 11-14, 35, 37, and 39 depend respectively from amended claims 1, 7, 36, and 38 and, as such, are construed to incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which they refer, see 35 U.S.C. § 112, fourth paragraph. Thus, claims 3-6, 11-14, 35, 37, and 39

are allowable for the reasons set forth above.

Support for the amendments to the specification and claims is clearly shown in the

drawings as originally filed.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 3-7, 11-14, and

35-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement

requirement be withdrawn.

6-7. Claims 1, 3-7, 11-14, and 35-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second

paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject

matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Examiner contends the recitations "symmetrical to the axis of rotation" (claim 1, line

3; claim 7, line 4; claim 36, line 3; claim 38, line 3) are unclear and inconsistent with what is

shown in Figure 3d. The Examiner suggests the recitation should be "having rotational

symmetry."

In response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 36, and 38 by replacing "symmetrical to

the axis of rotation" with "having rotational symmetry."

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 3-7, 11-14, and

35-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly

point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention be

withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that this patent application is in condition for allowance,

which allowance is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this

amendment or the patent application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

14

Appl'n No: 10/539,741 Amdt dated September 14, 2009 Reply to Office action dated August 4, 2009

Date: Sept. 14, 2009 Attorney Docket No: 25266-125053 Respectfully submitted,

David J. Ford (Reg. No. 62,462)

Clark Hill PLC

500 Woodward Avenue, Suite 3500

Detroit, MI 48226-3435

(313) 965-8575